

**SEP 18 2007****PATENT****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s): Venkat Selvamanickam, et al.

Title: HIGH THROUGHPUT CONTINUOUS PULSED LASER DEPOSITION  
PROCESS AND APPARATUS

App. No.: 10/602,294 Filed: June 23, 2003

Examiner: Karla A. Moore Group Art Unit: 1763

Customer No.: 34456 Confirmation No.: 1196

Atty. Dkt. No.: 1014-SP108-US

---

**MS PETITION**

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RENEWED PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Decision on Petition dated May 18, 2007, the undersigned hereby renews request for revival of the present application.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to a Notice or Action by the United States Patent & Trademark Office. The date of abandonment is the day after the expiration of the period set for reply in the Office Notice or Action plus any extensions of time actually obtained. Applicant hereby petitions for revival of this application.

Applicants acknowledge that a grantable petition requires: (1) Petition Fee, (2) Reply and/or Issue Fee, (3) Terminal Disclaimer with Disclaimer Fee for all utility and plant applications filed before June 8, 1995, and for all design applications, and (4) Statement that the entire delay was unintentional.

1. Petition Fee. Applicants believe that the petition fee is not currently due in light of the petition fee paid by the original Petition for Revival of Patent Abandoned Unintentionally.

However, to the extent that an additional fee is necessary for the granting of the present petition, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any required petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3797.

2. Reply and/or Fee. Applicants filing of the original petition for revival was accompanied by a document entitled "Reply to Office Action," directing the PTO to the divisional application filed October 28, 2006, US Application No. 11/554,428. The undersigned was informed by a USPTO representative within the Petitions Office on October 24, 2006 that the foregoing "Reply to Office Action" referencing the previously filed divisional application constituted an appropriate reply. However, to ensure that a proper reply is filed in the above-identified application, enclosed herewith is a Notice of Appeal, stated on page 2 of the Decision on Petition to be a proper reply to support a grantable petition.

3. Terminal Disclaimer. Since this utility/plant application was filed on or after June 8, 1995, no Terminal Disclaimer is required.

4. Statement. The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR §1.137(b) was unintentional.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

9/18/07

Jeffrey S. Abel, Reg. No. 36,079

Attorney for Applicant(s)

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY &  
WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 439-7199 (fax)